

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/848,952	05/03/2001	Marc Lurie	26625-703	6922	
21971	7590 02/01/2006		EXAMINER		
	ONSINI GOODRICH & R	RUTTEN, JAMES D			
650 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1050			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2192	2192	
			B. (00)	_	

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/848,952	LURIE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
J. Derek Rutten	2192	

<del>-</del>			i
	J. Derek Rutten	2192	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
time periods: a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS		(-7	
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a)  They raise new issues that would require further co (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	, ,,		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	•	•	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-38</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
-			

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No. 09/848,952

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Replacement of the phrase "one or more data element..." with positive recitation of "data elements..." changes the scope of independent claims 1, 15, 25, 27, 29, and 36 and would require further consideration and may require further search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive.

On page 11 of the reply, in the first full paragraph, Applicant essentially argues that the Wadhwa reference does not teach the data models as claimed, which include "the data model defining one or more data elements..." However, this limitation is not present in the proposed claims. The alternative language "one or more" has been removed from the claims. However, if interpreted using the phrase, Wadhwa teaches at least data relationship attributes (Wadhwa column 6 lines 59-63) as pointed out on page 6 of the 11/01/05 Final Action. As indicated in box 3 above, further consideration and/or search is required for the proposed amendment.

On page 11 paragraph 2, Applicant argues that "the references are devoid of any motivation for their combination", and suggests that no portion of the references was cited to support a motivation. However, review of the Final Action reveals the citation of Wadhwa column 7 lines 16-18 as support for motivation. This passage suggests that entity relationship models enable subsequent reuse. Reuse is a basic objective of object-oriented software, and allows a single implementation to be reused by a variety of applications, or in the case of Wright, a variety of clients, in an effort to reduce implementation costs. Therefore, Wadhwa provides motivation as cited in the Final Action.

In response to applicant's apparent argument that Wadhwa is nonanalogous art (top of page 12), it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Wright and Wadhwa are interested in the distribution of executable software in a heterogeneous environment and use modeling concepts as a tool to further that goal.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER